



IN REPLY REFER TO:  
L7615(YOSE-PM)

# United States Department of the Interior

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Yosemite National Park  
P. O. Box 577  
Yosemite, California 95389

### Memorandum

**To:** Garrett Chun, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

**From:** Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

**Subject:** NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2011-032 Parkwide Utility Security & Screening (37821)

The Executive Leadership Team has reviewed the proposed project/action and completed its environmental assessment documentation, and we have determined that there:

- Will not be any effect on threatened, endangered, or rare species and/or their critical habitat.
- Will not be any effect on historical, cultural, or archeological resources.
- Will not be serious or long-term undesirable environmental or visual effects.

The subject proposed project, therefore, is now cleared for all NEPA and NHPA compliance requirements as presented above. Project plans and specifications are approved and construction and/or project implementation can commence.

For the proposed project actions to be within compliance requirements during construction and/or project implementation, the following mitigations must be adhered to:

- An appropriate American Indian consultation strategy will be developed through the Park American Indian Liaison to identify and address any American Indian concerns prior to project implementation.

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 37821.

//Don L. Neubacher//  
Don L. Neubacher

Enclosure (with attachments)

cc: Statutory Compliance File

*The signed original of this document is on file at the  
Environmental Planning and Compliance Office in  
Yosemite National Park.*



## Categorical Exclusion Form

**Project:** 2011-032 Parkwide Utility Security & Screening

**PEPC Project Number:** 37821

**Project Description:**

This project will construct security fencing for key park utility facilities. Specific improvements include perimeter fencing for the El Portal wastewater treatment facility, Wawona wastewater treatment facility, six El Portal well sites and two El Portal water tank sites as well as gate access to the Tuolumne water treatment facility and handrail and fencing at the Tuolumne wastewater treatment facility. Fencing will be composed of 9-gauge galvanized wire with 2" mesh. Fencing shall be either 6 feet or 8 feet tall with one additional foot to install a post-top arm with three strands of barbed wire. Additionally, sites where there is no pre-existing chain link fence will require any new perimeter chain link fence to be black in color, this includes wire fabric, fence posts, horizontal bars, bracing cables, and wire arms. (ie. El Portal Well House #2, #3, #5, El Portal Water Tank #3 and #4); and sites where there is pre-existing standard galvanized fence will require any new improvements to match the standard galvanized appearance (ie. El Portal Wastewater Treatment Plant, Wawona Wastewater Treatment Plant).

To reduce the amount of soil disturbance, the new concrete within the proposed fence perimeter, as shown on the construction drawings, will be omitted from the project and replaced with 3" thick section of 3/4" minus crushed rock placed on top of the native soil. The imported rock shall be obtained from a source certified as "weed-free" by RMS Vegetation Branch. The native soil under the crushed rock will be left untouched - no excavation or compaction of native soil shall be allowed. A representative from the Anthropology Branch shall be present to monitor the site during the installation of the fence posts.

**Project Locations:**

Mariposa and Tuolumne Counties, CA

**Mitigations:**

- An appropriate American Indian consultation strategy will be developed through the Park American Indian Liaison to identify and address any American Indian concerns prior to project implementation.

**Describe the category used to exclude action from further NEPA analysis and indicate the number of the category (see Section 3-4 of DO-12):**

C.17 Construction of fencing enclosures or boundary fencing posing no effect on wildlife migrations.

**On the basis of the environmental impact information in the statutory compliance file, with which I am familiar, I am categorically excluding the described project from further NEPA analysis. No**

**exceptional circumstances (e.g. all boxes in the ESF are marked "no") or conditions in Section 3-6 apply, and the action is fully described in Section 3-4 of DO-12.**

//Don L. Neubacher//  
Park Superintendent

9/22/11  
Date

*The signed original of this document is on file at the  
Environmental Planning and Compliance Office in  
Yosemite National Park.*



# ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

## DO-12 APPENDIX 1

Date Form Initiated: 09/06/2011

Updated May 2007 - per 2004 Departmental Manual revisions and proposed Director's Order 12 changes

### A. PROJECT INFORMATION

**Park Name:** Yosemite National Park  
**Project Title:** 2011-032 Parkwide Utility Security & Screening  
**PEPC Project Number:** 37821  
**Project Type:** Facility Maintenance (FM)  
**Project Location:**  
     **County, State:** Mariposa, California   **District:** El Portal and Wawona  
     **County, State:** Tuolumne, California   **District:** Mather  
**Project Leader:** Garrett Chun

Is project a hot topic (controversial or sensitive issues that should be brought to attention of Regional Director)? No

### B. RESOURCE EFFECTS TO CONSIDER:

Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural resources	No Effect	Negligible Effects	Minor Effects	Exceeds Minor Effects	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
1. Geologic resources – soils, bedrock, streambeds, etc.		Negligible			All fence posts will be buried three feet deep in one foot diameter holes.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality		Negligible			Air quality will be minimally affected.
4. Soundscapes		Negligible			There will be some temporary construction noises during the fence installation.
5. Water quality or quantity	No				
6. Streamflow characteristics	No				
7. Marine or estuarine	No				

<b>Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural resources</b>	<b>No Effect</b>	<b>Negligible Effects</b>	<b>Minor Effects</b>	<b>Exceeds Minor Effects</b>	<b>Data Needed to Determine/Notes</b>
resources					
8. Floodplains or wetlands	No				
9. Land use, including occupancy, income, values, ownership, type of use	No				
10. Rare or unusual vegetation – old growth timber, riparian, alpine	No				
11. Species of special concern (plant or animal; state or federal listed or proposed for listing) or their habitat	No				
12. Unique ecosystems, biosphere reserves, World Heritage Sites		Negligible			Yosemite National Park is a World Heritage Site.
13. Unique or important wildlife or wildlife habitat	No				
14. Unique or important fish or fish habitat	No				
15. Introduce or promote non-native species (plant or animal)	No				
16. Recreation resources, including supply, demand, visitation, activities, etc.	No				
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources	No				All fences will be installed within utility areas.
18. Archeological		Negligible			El Portal Archeological District;

<b>Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural resources</b>	<b>No Effect</b>	<b>Negligible Effects</b>	<b>Minor Effects</b>	<b>Exceeds Minor Effects</b>	<b>Data Needed to Determine/Notes</b>
resources					well house #2 will require archeological monitoring.
19. Prehistoric/historic structure	No				
20. Cultural landscapes		Negligible			Tuolumne Historic District.
21. Ethnographic resources	No				
22. Museum collections (objects, specimens, and archival and manuscript collections)	No				
23. Socioeconomics, including employment, occupation, income changes, tax base, infrastructure	No				
24. Minority and low income populations, ethnography, size, migration patterns, etc.	No				
25. Energy resources	No				
26. Other agency or tribal land use plans or policies	No				
27. Resource, including energy, conservation potential, sustainability	No				
28. Urban quality, gateway communities, etc.	No				
29. Long-term management of resources or land/resource	No				

<b>Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural resources</b>	<b>No Effect</b>	<b>Negligible Effects</b>	<b>Minor Effects</b>	<b>Exceeds Minor Effects</b>	<b>Data Needed to Determine/Notes</b>
productivity					
30. Other important environment resources (e.g. geothermal, paleontological resources)?	No				

**C. MANDATORY CRITERIA**

<b>Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Comment or Data Needed to Determine</b>
A. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?		No		
B. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation, or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas?		No		
C. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA section 102(2)(E))?		No		
D. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		No		
E. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?		No		
F. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?		No		

<b>Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Comment or Data Needed to Determine</b>
G. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, as determined by either the bureau or office?		No		
H. Have significant impacts on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?		No		
I. Violate a federal law, or a state, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		No		
J. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?		No		
K. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)?		No		
L. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)?		No		

#### **D. OTHER INFORMATION**

1. Are personnel preparing this form familiar with the site? Yes
  - 1.A. Did personnel conduct a site visit? Yes, park Archeology staff.
2. Is the project in an approved plan such as a General Management Plan or an Implementation Plan with an accompanying NEPA document? No
3. Are there any interested or affected agencies or parties? No
4. Has consultation with all affected agencies or tribes been completed? N/A
5. Are there any connected, cumulative, or similar actions as part of the proposed action? (*e.g., other development projects in area or identified in GMP, adequate/available utilities to accomplish project*) No

#### **E. INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM SIGNATORIES**



<u>Interdisciplinary Team</u>	<u>Field of Expertise</u>
Don L. Neubacher	Superintendent
Kathleen Morse	Chief of Planning
Randy Fong	Chief of Project Management
Dale St. Vincent	Acting Chief of Administration Management
Ed Walls	Chief of Facilities Management
Joe Meyer	Acting Chief of Resources Management & Science
Marty Nielson	Chief of Business and Revenue Management
Tom Medema	Chief of Interpretation and Education
Charles Cuvelier	Chief of Visitor and Resource Protection
Garrett Chun	Project Leader
Elexis Mayer	Environmental Planning and Compliance Program Manager
Elexis Mayer	Acting Historic Preservation Officer
Renea Kennec	NEPA Specialist

#### F. SUPERVISORY SIGNATORY

*Based on the environmental impact information contained in the statutory compliance file and in this environmental screening form, environmental documentation for this stage of the subject project is complete.*

#### Recommended:

Compliance Specialists	Date
<u>//Renea Kennec//</u> Compliance Specialist – Renea Kennec	<u>9/7/11</u>
<u>Elexis J. Mayer//</u> Compliance Program Manager – Elexis Mayer	<u>9/20/11</u>
<u>//Randy Fong//</u> Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	<u>9/21/11</u>

#### Approved:

Superintendent	Date
<u>//Don L. Neubacher//</u> Don L. Neubacher	<u>9/22/11</u>

*The signed original of this document is on file at the Environmental Planning and Compliance Office in Yosemite National Park.*



## PARK ESF ADDENDUM

Today's Date: September 6, 2011

### PROJECT INFORMATION

**Park Name:** Yosemite National Park  
**Project Title:** 2011-032 Parkwide Utility Security & Screening  
**PEPC Project Number:** 37821  
**Project Type:** Facility Maintenance (FM)  
**Project Location:**  
**County, State:** Mariposa, California **District:** El Portal and Wawona  
**County, State:** Tuolumne, California **District:** Mather  
**Project Leader:** Garrett Chun

### PARK ESF ADDENDUM QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
<b>SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES CHECKLIST</b>				
Listed or proposed threatened or endangered species (Federal or State)?		No		
Species of special concern (Federal or State)?		No		
Park rare plants or vegetation?		No		
Potential habitat for any special-status species listed above?		No		
<b>NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT CHECKLIST</b>				
Entail ground disturbance?	Yes			All fence posts will be buried three feet deep in one foot diameter holes.
Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?	Yes			
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?		No		

<b>ESF Addendum Questions</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Data Needed to Determine/Notes</b>
Has a National Register form been completed?			NA	
Are there any structures on the park's List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect?		No		
<b>WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST</b>				
Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor?	Yes			Tuolumne and Merced Rivers.
Fall within the bed and banks AND will affect the free-flow of the river?		No		
Have the possibility of affecting water quality of the area?		No		
Remain consistent with its river segment classification?	Yes			
Fall on a tributary of a Wild and Scenic River?		No		
Will the project encroach or intrude upon the Wild and Scenic River corridor?		No		
Will the project unreasonably diminish scenic, recreational, or fish and wildlife values?		No		
Consistent with the provisions in the Merced River Plan Settlement Agreement?	Yes			
<b>WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST</b>				
Within designated Wilderness?		No		
Within a Potential Wilderness Addition?		No		

### Utility Security and Screening: Photos of Existing Site



Above picture shows the El Portal boneyard fence with grapevines on Foresta Road. Wastewater Treatment Plant is in the background.

Below picture shows the El Portal Wastewater Treatment Plant on Foresta Road. The intersection of Spur Road and Foresta Road is in the background.



## Utility Security and Screening: Photos of Existing Site



Above picture shows the El Portal Wastewater Treatment Plant on Spur Road. Note the steep slope behind the guardrail and trees to be removed in the background.

Below picture describes the back entrance to the El Portal Wastewater Treatment Plant. Existing pedestrian access will not be affected.



### Utility Security and Screening: Photos of Existing Site

---



EP Well House #2

EP Well #3  
House



Utility Security and Screening: Photos of Existing Site

---



EP Tank #3

EP Tank #4



### Utility Security and Screening: Photos of Existing Site

---



**EP Well  
House #4**

**EP Well House #5**

Highway 140 is  
directly above and  
behind well house.







# ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON CULTURAL RESOURCES

## A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite National Park

### 2. Project Description:

**Project Name:** Parkwide Utility Security & Screening

**Prepared by:** Renea Kennec **Date Prepared:** 09/06/2011 **Telephone:** 209-379-1038

**PEPC Project Number:** 37821

**Locations:**

**County, State:** Mariposa, CA **District:** El Portal and Wawona

**County, State:** Tuolumne, CA **District:** Mather

### 3. Has the area of potential effects been surveyed to identify cultural resources?

No

Yes

**Source or reference:** Tuolumne Meadows Historic District; El Portal Archeological District.

**Check here if no known cultural resources will be affected. (If this is because area has been disturbed, please explain or attach additional information to show the disturbance**

**was so extensive as to preclude intact cultural deposits.)**

### 4. Potentially Affected Resource(s):

Tuolumne Meadows Historic District

### 5. The proposed action will: (check as many as apply)

Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure

Replace historic features/elements in kind

Add non-historic features/elements to a historic structure

Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment (inc. terrain)

Add non-historic features/elements (inc. visual, audible, or atmospheric) to a historic setting or cultural landscape

Disturb, destroy, or make archeological resources inaccessible

Disturb, destroy, or make ethnographic resources inaccessible

Potentially affect presently unidentified cultural resources

Begin or contribute to deterioration of historic features, terrain, setting, landscape elements, or archeological or ethnographic resources

Involve a real property transaction (exchange, sale, or lease of land or structures)

\_\_\_\_\_ Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**6. Supporting Study Data:**

(Attach if feasible; if action is in a plan, EA or EIS, give name and project or page number.)

**B. REVIEWS BY CULTURAL RESOURCE SPECIALISTS**

**The park 106 coordinator requested review by the park's cultural resource specialist/advisors as indicated by check-off boxes or as follows:**

---

[ X ] Archeologist

Name: Laura Kirn

Date: 08/18/2011

Comments: YOSE 1999PA, Stipulation C.2.g.

*Check if project does not involve ground disturbance* [ ]

Assessment of Effect: \_\_\_ No Historic Properties Affected     X  No Adverse Effect    \_\_\_ Adverse Effect    \_\_\_ Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

---

[ X ] Anthropologist

Name: Jennifer Hardin

Date: 07/28/2011

Comments: An appropriate American Indian consultation strategy will be developed through the Park American Indian Liaison to identify and address any American Indian concerns prior to project implementation.

*Check if project does not involve ground disturbance* [ ]

Assessment of Effect: \_\_\_ No Historic Properties Affected    \_\_\_ No Adverse Effect    \_\_\_ Adverse Effect    \_\_\_ Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: An appropriate American Indian consultation strategy will be developed through the Park American Indian Liaison to identify and address any American Indian concerns prior to project implementation.

---

[ X ] Historical Landscape Architect

Name: David Humphrey

Date: 09/06/2011

Comments: Per YOSE 1999 PA, Stipulation C.2.g.

*Check if project does not involve ground disturbance* [ ]

Assessment of Effect: \_\_\_ No Historic Properties Affected     X  No Adverse Effect    \_\_\_ Adverse Effect    \_\_\_ Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

---

**No Reviews From:** Curator, Historical Architect, Historian, 106 Advisor, Other Advisor

---

### **C. PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR'S REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Assessment of Effect:

\_\_\_\_\_ No Historic Properties Affected        X   No Adverse Effect      \_\_\_\_\_ Adverse Effect

2. Documentation Method:

A. STANDARD 36 CFR PART 800 CONSULTATION

Further consultation under 36 CFR Part 800 is needed.

B. STREAMLINED REVIEW UNDER THE 2008 SERVICEWIDE PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT (PA)

The above action meets all conditions for a streamlined review under section III of the 2008 Servicewide PA for Section 106 compliance.

APPLICABLE STREAMLINED REVIEW Criteria  
(Specify 1-16 of the list of streamlined review criteria.)

C. PLAN-RELATED UNDERTAKING

Consultation and review of the proposed undertaking were completed in the context of a plan review process, in accordance with the 2008 Servicewide PA and 36 CFR Part 800.  
Specify plan/EA/EIS:

D. UNDERTAKING RELATED TO ANOTHER AGREEMENT

The proposed undertaking is covered for Section 106 purposes under another document such as a statewide agreement established in accord with 36 CFR 800.7 or counterpart regulations.  
Specify: 1999 Programmatic Agreement

E. COMBINED NEPA/NHPA Document

Documentation is required for the preparation of an EA/FONSI or an EIS/ROD has been developed and used so as also to meet the requirements of 36 CFR 800.3 through 800.6

F. No Potential to Cause Effects [800.3(a) (1)]

G. Memo to SHPO/THPO

H. Memo to ACHP

3. Additional Consulting Parties Information:

Additional Consulting Parties: No

4. Stipulations and Conditions:

Following are listed any stipulations or conditions necessary to ensure that the assessment of effect above is consistent with 36 CFR Part 800 criteria of effect or to avoid or reduce potential adverse effects.

5. Mitigations/Treatment Measures:

Measures to prevent or minimize loss or impairment of historic/prehistoric properties:  
(Remember that setting, location, and use may be relevant.)

No Assessment of Effect mitigations identified.

**D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:**

Acting

Historic Preservation Officer //Elexis J. Mayer// Date 9/20/11  
Elexis Mayer

**E. SUPERINTENDENT'S APPROVAL**

**The proposed work conforms to the NPS *Management Policies and Cultural Resource Management Guideline*, and I have reviewed and approve the recommendations, stipulations, or conditions noted in Section C of this form.**

Superintendent: //Don L. Neubacher// Date: 9/22/11  
Don L. Neubacher

*The signed original of this document is on file at the  
Environmental Planning and Compliance Office in  
Yosemite National Park.*